

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 20, 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 for failing to claim statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, “a wizard to process data” and “a signal integrator to integrate the data signal into the video signal such that an integrated signal is formed,” thereby mooting the Examiner’s rejection. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 20, 21 and 23 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable due at least to their respective dependencies.

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under both 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and 35 USC 101. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Applicants have amended claim 6 to recite that, “the wizard processes data directed at a game show and resultant processed data is integrated into the integrated signal” thereby mooting the Examiner’s rejections of claim 6. Applicants have amended claims 7 and 8 in a manner substantially similar to that of claim 6. Accordingly, claims 7 and 8 are also allowable.

Claims 1 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) on Gupta. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, “a signal integrator to integrate the data signal into the video signal such that an integrated signal is formed.” Gupta does not disclose such a feature. The Examiner asserts that, “Gupta discloses a monitor with a data signal and a video signal (Fig. 3), which are thereby deemed integrated.” The display of a data signal and a video signal on the same monitor does not disclose or suggest integrating the two signals into an integrated signal. Applicants further note that Gupta, particularly as shown in FIG. 10 and explained in detail in paragraphs [0111] through [0117], teaches a system having separate video and data signals. Separate signals are not an integrated signal.

As detailed in applicants' earlier response, in Gupta, a database containing a series of annotations is formed. Each of the annotations contains a time period corresponding to a video program over which the annotation should be displayed. As shown in FIG. 10, the annotations and the video signal are displayed in a split screen format. It is crucial in Gupta for the video and data signals to be separately maintained, because, as detailed in paragraphs [0007] through [0010], the invention of Gupta is designed to allow the same annotations to be displayed with several different video signals without altering the annotations, wherein the compression rates of the video signals differ. Gupta teaches a method in paragraphs [0096] through [0100] of synchronizing the display of the annotations with the different compression rates of the video signal such that student watching the video will receive the annotations over the periods desired by the instructor. Claim 1 is therefore allowable over Gupta.

Additionally, claim 22 recites that, "the data signal is integrated into the video signal such that a single integrated signal is formed." Again, the displaying of a separate data signal and video signal on a display does not disclose or suggest the integration of the signals into a single integrated signal. Claim 22 is therefore allowable over Gupta.

Claims 2, 3 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Gupta in view of Bayeh. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 2, 3 and 6-8 depend from allowable claim 1, and Bayeh does not overcome the deficiencies discussed above with regard to claim 1. More particularly, Bayeh teaches a method for converting data into an HTML data stream. Bayeh does not disclose or suggest the use of a video signal or the integration of a video signal and a data signal into an integrated signal. Consequently, claims 2, 3 and 6-8 are allowable due at least to their respective dependencies.

Claims 17-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Gupta and Bayeh in further view of Logan (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030093790). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 17 recites, “integrating the HTML code into the television program such that an integrated program signal is formed.” As detailed above, Gupta does not disclose or suggest such a feature, and actually teaches away from this feature by disclosing instead a system having separate video and data signals. Displaying these separate signals on a display does not disclose or suggest forming an integrated signal as recited in claim 17. Neither Bayeh, as discussed above, nor Logan overcomes this deficiency in Gupta, nor has the Examiner so cited the references. Logan merely discloses a system used to record, edit and playback television programs using metadata. Logan does not disclose, “integrating HTML code into a television program such that an integrated program signal is formed,” as recited in claim 17. Claim 17 is therefore allowable over the combination of Gupta, Bayeh and Logan.

Claim 18 depends from allowable claim 17 and is therefore allowable due at least to its dependency.

Claim 19 recites, “integrating said HTML code into a television signal to form an integrated signal such that the HTML code is displayed on a display device as part of the television signal.” As detailed above, neither Gupta, Bayeh nor Logan discloses such a feature alone or in combination. Accordingly, claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20, 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Gupta in view of Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter, “AAPA”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

AAPA does not overcome the deficiencies of Gupta discussed above in regard to claim 1, nor has the Examiner cited AAPA as doing so. Accordingly, claims 20, 21 and 23, which depend from allowable claim 1, are allowable due at least to their respective dependencies.

No new matter has been added.


Applicants respectfully solicit an early action allowing the claims.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief, including extensions of time, and

authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Attorney Docket No. 577172003800.

Dated: March 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Adam Keser  
Registration No. 54,217  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7301